

1 **THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC LIBRARY**
2 **CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION BOARD MINUTES**

3
4 **CalEPA Building**
5 **1001 I Street**
6 **(Central Valley Auditorium)**
7 **Sacramento, California 95814**
8 **October 28, 2003**

9 **CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

10 Dr. Kevin Starr, State Librarian of California, convened the meeting
11 at 1:23 p.m. The following Board members were present:

12 Senator Dede Alpert; Assembly Member Ellen Corbett; Treasurer
13 Philip Angelides (represented initially by Ms. Barbara A. Lloyd); Ms.
14 Shelley Mateo representing the Director of Finance; and Barton "Bart"
15 P. Pachino, Esq.

16 Before beginning the business portion of the meeting, Dr. Starr
17 recognized board members who wished to make opening remarks.
18 Senator Alpert and Assembly Member Ellen Corbett expressed concern
19 about the fires in Southern California and inquired if any applicants
20 were unable to attend the meeting to provide comment. Mr. Richard
21 Hall, Library Bond Act Manager, responded that some individuals were
22 unable to attend, but there were representatives present who could
23 provide comment on their behalf. Members of the audience confirmed
24 this.

1 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

2 *Ms. Alpert moved that the California Public Library*
3 *Construction and Renovation Board adopt the*
4 *agenda. The motion carried unanimously.*
5

6 **APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 19, 2002, BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

7 *It was moved and seconded (Pachino/Mateo) that*
8 *the California Public Library Construction and*
9 *Renovation Board approve the minutes of the*
10 *December 19, 2002, meeting. The motion carried*
11 *unanimously.*
12

13 Dr. Starr suggested, with concurrence from Board Members, that
14 statewide Assembly and Senate members present be given the
15 opportunity to comment first to enable them to return to their work at the
16 Capitol. Comments were heard from:

17 Lois Wolk
18 Assembly Member, 8th Assembly District, spoke on behalf of
19 Fairfield-Cordelia and West Sacramento Library projects.
20

21 Fran Pavley
22 Assembly Member, 41st Assembly District, spoke on behalf of
23 Calabasas Library project.
24

25 Dave Cogdill
26 Assembly Member, 25th Assembly District, spoke on behalf of
27 Mammoth Lakes Library project.
28

29 Trice Harvey
30 Retired Assembly Member, 32nd Assembly District, spoke on behalf
31 of Frazier Park
32 (Kern County) Library project.
33

34 Dick Rainey
35 Retired Senator spoke on behalf of Walnut Creek Library project.
36

1 Joe Nation
2 Assembly Member, 6th Assembly District, spoke on behalf of San
3 Rafael Pickleweed Library project.

4
5 Brett Granlund
6 Assembly Member, 65th Assembly District, spoke on behalf of
7 Hesperia Library project.

8
9 Dede Alpert
10 Senator, representing Christine Kehoe, Assembly Member 76th
11 District, spoke on behalf of the San Diego Main Library project.

12
13
14 **OVERVIEW OF THE STAFF REVIEW OF SECOND CYCLE LIBRARY**
15 **BOND ACT APPLICATIONS**

16
17 Dr. Starr asked Mr. Hall to present an overview of the evaluation
18 process.

19 Mr. Hall referred to the regulations approved by the Board that
20 stated there would be three cycles and that today's meeting would
21 determine awards up to \$110 million for the second cycle. Any funds that
22 remained unallocated would roll to the third and final cycle, the deadline
23 for which is January 16, 2004.

24 Mr. Hall reported that 67 applications were received, one of which
25 was ineligible, leaving a total of 66 applications that were reviewed during
26 a six-month period. The staff feels that the applications submitted for the
27 second cycle are stronger than those received in the first cycle. Those
28 applying for the second time had the benefit of staff ratings and
29 comments, individual staff consultations, and access on the Office of
30 Library Construction Web site to application documents from Cycle 1
31 funded applications.

1 Mr. Hall announced that staff consultations will be available for
2 Cycle 2 applicants who do not receive a grant, and he asked individuals to
3 request a conference via the Office of Library Construction e-mail
4 address.

5 Mr. Hall referred Board Members to staff findings for the 66
6 applications, which are requesting a total of \$547 million in state funds.
7 He reviewed the breakdown by evaluation category:

- 8 • "Outstanding" category -- 13 projects -- approximately \$91.5
9 million
- 10 • "Very Good" category -- 38 projects -- approximately \$373
11 million
- 12 • "Acceptable" category -- 15 projects -- approximately \$78.5
13 million
- 14 • "Limitations" category -- 1 project -- approximately \$4.5 million
- 15 • "Serious Limitations" category -- none

16 Mr. Hall referred Board Members to their binders for a series of
17 maps reflecting grant application locations. The first map showed the
18 location of Cycle 1 funded projects (10 counties). Dr. Starr commented
19 that it was very important to note the geographical concentrations of the
20 Cycle 1 funded projects: the Bay Area, the Central Valley, and a very
21 strong south coast and San Bernardino presence.

22 The next map showed the county location for all Cycle 2
23 applications. Dr. Starr noted that applications were distributed
24 throughout the state.

1 The next two maps showed the county location for Cycle 2
2 applications with an overall "Outstanding" rating, with one demonstrating
3 population density. The same two types of maps were presented showing
4 the county location for Cycle 2 applications with an overall rating of "Very
5 Good."

6 Dr. Starr emphasized to Board Members and to those in the
7 audience that no directive concerning geographic distribution was given
8 to the evaluation team. The fact that the distribution turned out to be
9 extensive was gratifying.

10 Mr. Hall concurred with Dr. Starr's comments and stated that it was
11 important to display the population density distribution, because the first
12 review consideration in the Bond Act is the consideration of the needs of
13 rural and urban areas. It was hoped that the population distribution
14 maps would assist the Board in visualizing that.

15 The same two types of maps were presented showing the county
16 location for Cycle 2 applications with an overall rating of "Acceptable." A
17 map demonstrating the location of the Cycle 1 funded applications along
18 with the Cycle 2 applications with an overall rating of "Outstanding" was
19 included as a reference. The final map was of population distribution
20 alone, applications overlaid.

21 Mr. Hall reviewed the format of the evaluation summary sheets,
22 which are based on the Bond Act review criteria. Staff does not evaluate

1 the criterion related to rural and urban applications. The four rated
2 categories relate to the age and condition of the existing library, the
3 response of the project to the needs of the residents, the appropriate
4 integration of technology, and the appropriateness of the proposed site.
5 These criteria were rated by staff following a thorough and extensive
6 evaluation process, which was essentially the same process used in Cycle
7 1. One difference in the application evaluation process used for Cycle 2
8 was in the "Age and Condition" rating category. For Cycle 2, a broader
9 perspective of the rating of "Outstanding" for existing library facilities was
10 used. In addition to applications where there is no existing library, library
11 buildings built prior to 1950 also received a rating of "Outstanding."

12 In response to Dr. Starr's inquiry, Mr. Hall indicated that there are
13 55 evaluation factors for each application, with three reviewers per
14 application, which means that there were 165 evaluation decisions per
15 application. With 66 applications, the result is over 10,000 individual
16 rating decisions made by staff members during the evaluation process.

17 In all, there was over 50 hours of staff time utilized for each application.

18 In addressing the situation where Cycle 1 applicants resubmitted
19 their applications for Cycle 2, Mr. Hall indicated that in some cases lower
20 ratings were given during Cycle 2. He explained that applications were
21 evaluated and rated in relation to the other Cycle 2 applications.

22 Depending on the application pool, it is possible for individual ratings for

1 the same project to change from one cycle to the other, either going up
2 or going down.

3 Dr. Starr asked how many applications experienced a change. Mr.
4 Hall indicated 13 overall ratings changed: 12 went up and one went
5 down.

6 Dr. Starr asked if changes reflected the increased competition and
7 increased expertise on the part of the applicants. Mr. Hall replied that
8 both instances were true. He indicated that applicants had been
9 reminded of the competitive nature of the process during the workshops
10 and during individual consultation and were advised to continue to
11 strengthen their applications since applications are rated in relation to
12 each other.

13 In response to Dr. Starr's question about the most dramatic
14 improvement, Mr. Hall indicated that one application moved from an
15 overall rating of "Acceptable" to "Outstanding."

16 In completing his review of the evaluation summary sheet, Mr. Hall
17 noted that financial capacity, which applies only to applications for new
18 library facilities, is not rated. He pointed out the "Non-evaluative
19 Comment" section of the form and the section that provides summary
20 information about the project type, square footage, state grant amount,
21 etc.

1 Senator Alpert asked about Priority 2 renovation applications that
2 could not apply as Priority 1 applications due to the technological status
3 [*of their local schools*]. Mr. Hall responded that applications that are not
4 within the attendance area of a public school that has inadequate
5 telecommunications infrastructure cannot, through no fault of their own,
6 apply as Priority 1 applications. There is no action the applicant can take,
7 because it relates to a local public school condition. This is a different
8 situation than is present for applications for new library facilities.

9 Assembly Member Corbett inquired about the differences in the
10 evaluation team between the first and second cycles. Mr. Hall indicated
11 that he believed there to be no negative result from the changes made to
12 the composition of the evaluation team. Dr. Starr pointed out that the
13 State Library lost over 51 positions during budget cuts, which
14 necessitated changes to the evaluation team.

15 In response to Assembly Member Corbett's question concerning
16 why applications that had received an "Outstanding" rating in a criterion
17 would drop during Cycle 2, Mr. Hall pointed out that applicants were
18 reminded at workshops and during staff consultations to continue to
19 improve their application documents because of the competitive nature of
20 the process and the different "pool" of applications.

21 In response to a question from Ms. Lloyd, Mr. Hall indicated that
22 there was no one criterion that experienced a drop in rating more than
23 another.

1 Dr. Starr summarized the discussion by saying that each Cycle 2
2 application was rated individually within the cycle, and not based on Cycle
3 1 ratings. Mr. Hall pointed out that this will also be the case for Cycle 3
4 applications that are re-submittals.

5 Ms. Lloyd asked Mr. Hall to describe how the evaluation process
6 was structured with the evaluation team consisting of several individuals.
7 Mr. Hall indicated that there were nine individuals on the evaluation team.
8 Each week a specific number of applications was reviewed by the
9 individuals and discussed at the end of the week by the full team. Raters
10 periodically reconfirmed their ratings. After all evaluations had been
11 rated, they were reviewed by the evaluation team once again to ensure
12 equitable and consistent application of rating criteria, including those
13 where there were differences in ratings between Cycle 1 and Cycle 2.

14 Dr. Starr pointed out that during the evaluation process, there was
15 a "firewall" around the evaluation team to ensure their objective
16 consideration of the applications.

17 Assembly Member Corbett congratulated and thanked the staff for
18 their work and the presentation of the information for the Board
19 members. She repeated her concern for applications that had slipped
20 from a rating of "4" to a lower rating. She noted that it appeared that the
21 criterion related to site had the highest number of reductions yet site
22 would seem to be a fairly stable category. She asked Mr. Hall to clarify
23 how that could happen. Mr. Hall replied that he understood her thinking

1 and replied that some site conditions can change, including the number of
2 bus stops, geotechnical information, or the way in which the applicant
3 described the site portions of the application. In general, however, it was
4 that other applicants did a better job at clearly communicating the
5 positive aspects of their proposed sites than did the applicant whose
6 rating declined.

7 Dr. Starr announced a brief break and asked the audience to
8 consider the content of their presentations during the break to ensure
9 value-added content and reduce repetition, reminding them that the
10 meeting facility was available only until 5:00 p.m.

11 [A recess was taken from 2:18 p.m. to 2:26 p.m.]

12 Following the brief recess, Dr. Starr called for public comment. The
13 following speakers were heard.

14 *[A transcript of full speaker comments is available on the*
15 *Office of Library Construction Web site:*
16 www.olc.library.ca.gov].

17

18 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

19 Heather Fargo
20 Mayor of the City of Sacramento, spoke on behalf of the North Natomas
21 Library project.

22

23 Roger Dickenson
24 Sacramento County Board Supervisor, spoke on behalf of the North
25 Natomas Library project.

26

27 Gary Davis
28 Board President, Natomas Unified School District Board of Trustees, spoke
29 on behalf of the North Natomas Library project.

1 Marie Smith
2 President, American River College, spoke on behalf of the North Natomas
3 Library project.
4
5 Martin Gomez
6 Executive Director, Friends and Foundation of the San Francisco Public
7 Library, spoke on behalf of the Richmond Branch Library Expansion and
8 Renovation project.
9
10 Glen Ramisky
11 Friends and Foundation Board Member spoke on behalf of the Richmond
12 Branch Library project.
13
14 Jim Cook
15 Director, Redevelopment and Housing, County of Monterey, for Assembly
16 Member Simon Salinas, spoke on behalf of the Castroville Community
17 Library project.
18
19 David Green
20 Co-Chair of Fundraising, spoke on behalf of the Castroville Community
21 Library project.
22
23 Mike McGowan
24 County Supervisor, Yolo County Board of Supervisors, District 1, spoke on
25 behalf of the West Sacramento Library project.
26
27 Christopher Cabaldon
28 Mayor, City of West Sacramento, spoke on behalf of the West Sacramento
29 Library project.
30
31 Patrick Campbell
32 Interim Superintendent, Washington Unified School District, West
33 Sacramento, spoke on behalf of the West Sacramento Library project.
34
35 Helen Thompson
36 Member, Yolo County Board of Supervisors, spoke on behalf of the West
37 Sacramento Library project.
38
39 Julie Sauls
40 Representing Assembly Member Kevin McCarthy, 32nd District, spoke on
41 behalf of the Frazier Park Library project (Kern County).
42

1 Darren Lim
2 Representing Senator Roy Ashburn, spoke on behalf of the Frazier Park
3 Library project (Kern County) and Tulare County Library projects.
4
5 Shelly Mason
6 Principal, El Tejon School, spoke on behalf of the Frazier Park Library
7 project (Kern County).
8
9 Ed Robie
10 Supervisor, Lake County, spoke on behalf of the Middletown Library
11 project.
12
13 Robert Gomez
14 Superintendent of Schools, Lake County, spoke on behalf of the
15 Middletown Library project.
16
17 David Kehoe
18 County Supervisor, Shasta County Board of Supervisors, spoke on behalf
19 of the City of Redding (Shasta County) Library project.
20
21 Carolyn Chambers
22 Director, Shasta County Library, spoke on behalf of the City of Redding
23 (Shasta County) Library project.
24
25 Mark Cibula
26 Mayor, City of Redding, spoke on behalf of the City of Redding (Shasta
27 County) Library project.
28
29 Deborah Smitty
30 Publisher/President, *The Record Searchlight*, spoke on behalf of the City
31 of Redding (Shasta County) Library project.
32
33 James Chaffee
34 San Francisco Public Library, spoke on behalf of libraries in San Francisco.
35
36 Susan Hildreth
37 City Librarian, San Francisco Public Library, spoke on behalf of the
38 Richmond Branch Library project.
39
40 Kevin Kwon
41 Representing Assembly Member Leland Yee, 12th District, spoke on behalf
42 of the Richmond Branch Library project.
43

1 James Bozajian
2 Mayor, City of Calabasas, spoke on behalf of the Calabasas Library
3 project.
4
5 Fred Gaines
6 Vice-President, Calabasas Library Commission, spoke on behalf of the
7 Calabasas Library project.
8
9 Susan Kent
10 City Librarian, Los Angeles Public Library, spoke on behalf of the Harbor
11 Gateway-Harbor City Branch Library project.
12
13 Linda Wood
14 County Librarian, Alameda County, spoke on behalf of the Castro Valley
15 Library project.
16
17 Fontayne Holmes
18 Assistant City Librarian, Los Angeles Public Library, spoke on behalf of the
19 Harbor Gateway-Harbor City Branch Library project.
20
21 Donna Jones
22 Friends of the Castro Valley Library, spoke on behalf of the Castro Valley
23 Library project.
24
25 Carolyn Moskovitz
26 Manager, Castro Valley Library, spoke on behalf of the Castro Valley
27 Library project.
28
29 Nettie Washington
30 Council Member, City of Tulare, spoke on behalf of the Tulare Library
31 project.
32
33 Jim Madaffer
34 Council Member, City of San Diego, introduced a video from San Diego
35 Mayor Dick Murphy on behalf of the San Diego Main Library project.
36
37 Raymond Bragg
38 Director, Redevelopment and Special Projects, City of Fontana,
39 representing Ed Kieczykowski, San Bernardino County Librarian and Mark
40 Nuaimi, City of Fontana Mayor, spoke on behalf of the Fontana Library
41 project.
42
43 Josie Gonzales
44 Council Member, City of Fontana, spoke on behalf of the Fontana Library
45 project.

1 Jim Madaffer
2 City Council Member, City of San Diego, spoke on behalf of the San Diego
3 Main Library project.
4
5 Dr. Matthew Lin
6 Mayor, City of San Marino, spoke on behalf of the San Marino Public
7 Library project.
8
9 Suzanne Crowell
10 Former Mayor, City of San Marino, spoke on behalf of the San Marino
11 Library project.
12
13 Bob Downer
14 Trustee, San Marino Library, spoke on behalf of the San Marino Library
15 project.
16
17 Betty Brown
18 City Council Member, City of San Marino, spoke on behalf of the San
19 Marino Library project.
20
21 Carol Baca
22 Representing Sheriff Lee Baca, County of Los Angeles, spoke on behalf of
23 the San Marino Library project.
24
25 Emily Barth
26 Student, Huntington Middle High, spoke on behalf of the San Marino
27 Library project.
28
29 Dan Savage
30 Representing Senator Gilbert Cedillo, 22nd District, spoke on behalf of the
31 San Marino Library project.
32
33 Tom Farnetti
34 Supervisor, Mono County Board, spoke on behalf of a Mono County
35 Library project.
36
37 Gwen Regalia
38 Mayor, City of Walnut Creek, spoke on behalf of the Walnut Creek Library
39 project.
40
41 Dan Walden
42 President, Walnut Creek School Board, spoke on behalf of the Walnut
43 Creek Library project.
44

1 Kathy Sorensen
2 Director of Community Services, Signal Hill, for Mayor Michael Knoll and
3 for City Librarian
4
5 Carol Malloy
6 Spoke on behalf of the Signal Hill Library project.
7
8 Chuck Bookhammer
9 Assistant Chief of Staff to Chair Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, Los Angeles
10 County Board of Supervisors, spoke on behalf of the Lawndale Library
11 project.
12
13 Harold Hoffman
14 Mayor, City of Lawndale, spoke on behalf of the Lawndale Library project.
15
16 Maria Calix
17 Board President, Centinela Valley Union High School District, spoke on
18 behalf of the Lawndale Library project.
19
20 Judith Auth
21 Director, Riverside City Library, spoke on behalf of the Arlington Library
22 project.
23
24 Steve Tate
25 Council Member, City of Morgan Hill, spoke on behalf of the Morgan Hill
26 Library project.
27
28 Bob Jacobson
29 Chairman, Fallbrook Library Campaign, representing County Library
30 Director Marilyn Crouch, spoke on behalf of the Fallbrook Library project.
31
32 Jennifer Jeffries
33 President, Friends of the Library, spoke on behalf of the Fallbrook Library
34 project.
35
36 Eleanor Schmidt
37 Director of Library Services, City of Long Beach, representing Mayor
38 Beverly O'Neill, spoke on behalf of the MacArthur Park Library project.
39
40 Sarabruth Prakh
41 Community representative, spoke on behalf of the MacArthur Park Library
42 project.
43

1 Al Boro
2 Mayor, City of San Rafael, spoke on behalf of the Pickleweed Park Library
3 project.
4
5 Jeanette Sotomayor
6 San Rafael resident, spoke on behalf of the Pickleweed Park Library
7 project.
8
9 Karen Bosch-Cobb
10 Interim County Librarian, Fresno County Library, spoke on behalf of the
11 Mendota Library project.
12
13 Gil Rossette
14 Superintendent, Mendota Unified School District, spoke on behalf of the
15 Mendota Library project.
16
17 Primo Santini
18 Mayor, City of Lincoln, spoke on behalf of the Lincoln Library project.
19
20 Karen Bosch-Cobb
21 Interim County Librarian, Fresno County Library, spoke on behalf of the
22 Fowler Library project.
23
24 John Cruz
25 Superintendent, Fowler School District, spoke on behalf of the Fowler
26 Library project.
27
28 Rollie Wright
29 Director, Parks and Recreation, Half Moon Bay, spoke on behalf of the
30 Half Moon Bay Library project.
31
32 Abby Land
33 City Council Member, City of West Hollywood, spoke on behalf of the
34 West Hollywood Park Library project.
35
36 Harry Price
37 Vice-Mayor, City of Fairfield, spoke on behalf of the Fairfield-Cordelia
38 Library project.
39
40 Anne Griffin
41 Vice-President, Fairfield-Suisun School Board, spoke on behalf of the
42 Fairfield-Cordelia Library project.
43

1 Gordon Conable
2 Representing Gary Christmas, Riverside County Librarian, spoke on behalf
3 of the Temecula, Murrieta, Riverside, Moreno Valley, and Rubidoux library
4 projects.
5
6 Albert Tovar
7 Library Director, Azusa City Library, spoke on behalf of the Azusa Library
8 project.
9
10 Xilonin Cruz-Gonzales
11 School Board Member, City of Azusa, spoke on behalf of the Azusa Library
12 project.
13
14 Cristina Madrid
15 Mayor, City of Azusa, spoke on behalf of the Azusa Library project.
16
17 Pat Harper
18 Library Director, Siskiyou County Free Library, spoke on behalf of the
19 Dorris Library project.
20
21 Ed Traverso
22 Superintendent, Butte Valley Unified School District, spoke on behalf of
23 the Dorris Library project.
24
25 Nicky Stanke
26 Director, Stockton-San Joaquin County Public Library, spoke on behalf of
27 the Northeast Stockton Library and the Manteca Library projects.
28
29 Michael Cannon
30 Lindsay Unified School District, spoke on behalf of the Lindsey Joint Use
31 Library project.
32
33 Diana Ingersoll
34 Director, Public Works, City of Seaside, spoke on behalf of the Seaside
35 Library project.
36
37 Steve Bloomer
38 Mayor Pro Tem, City of Seaside, spoke on behalf of the Seaside Library
39 project.
40
41 Leslie Payne
42 Principal Librarian, Monterey County Free Libraries, spoke on behalf of the
43 Seaside Library project.
44

1 Ms. Dawson
2 Friends of Seaside, spoke on behalf of the Seaside Library project.
3
4 Mary Ann Lutz
5 City Council Member, City of Monrovia, and representing Assembly
6 Member Carol Liu, 44th District, spoke on behalf of the Monrovia Library
7 project.
8
9 Carrie Yoshida
10 Representing Senator Bob Margett, 29th District, spoke on behalf of the
11 Monrovia Library project.
12
13 Lenore Masterson
14 Chairman, Marina Larger Library Committee, spoke on behalf of the
15 Marina Library project.
16
17 John Adams
18 County Librarian, Orange County Library, spoke on behalf of the Laguna
19 Niguel Library project.
20
21 Ron Dempsey
22 Capistrano Unified School District, spoke on behalf of the Laguna Niguel
23 Library project.
24
25 Tim Casey
26 City Manager, Laguna Niguel, spoke on behalf of the Laguna Niguel
27 Branch Library project.
28
29 Margaret Donnellan Todd
30 County Librarian, County of Los Angeles Public Library, spoke on behalf of
31 the East San Gabriel Library project.
32
33 Carol McLaughlin
34 Assistant to the City Manager, City of La Mesa, spoke on behalf of the La
35 Mesa Library project.
36
37 Maggie Hoolihan
38 Deputy Mayor, City of Encinitas, spoke on behalf of the Encinitas Library
39 project.
40
41 Richard King
42 Consultant, spoke on behalf of the Encinitas Library project.
43

1 Barbara Pierce
2 Resident, Redwood City, spoke on behalf of the Redwood Shores Library
3 project.
4
5 Peter Warfield
6 San Francisco resident, expressed concern about the Richmond Branch
7 Library Expansion project.
8
9 Debra Doyle
10 Chair, Friends of the Library, Richmond, spoke on behalf of the Richmond
11 Branch Library Expansion project.
12
13 Christopher Townsend
14 Representing Senator Tom Torlakson, 7th District, and Assembly Member
15 Joe Canciamilla, 11th District, spoke on behalf of the Prewett Library
16 project.
17
18 Bill Gegg
19 Assistant City Manager, City of Antioch, spoke on behalf of the Prewett
20 Library project.
21
22 Arnie Simonson
23 City Council Member, City of Antioch, spoke on behalf of the Prewett
24 Library project.
25
26 Miguel Alaniz
27 Director, Inglewood Public Library, representing Council Member Eloy
28 Morales, City of Inglewood, spoke on behalf of the Inglewood Library
29 project.
30
31 Dennis Nowicki
32 Mayor, City of Hesperia, spoke on behalf of the Hesperia Library project.
33

34 **SECOND CYCLE GRANT AWARDS**

35 Following the public comment, Dr. Starr noted that approximately
36 100 individuals made comments and thanked speakers for the eloquent
37 testimony.

38 Assembly Member Corbett inquired about the timing of the release
39 of funds following grant award. Mr. Hall replied that immediately

1 following grant award, staff works with the grant recipient to complete
2 the grant agreement. Once the agreement is signed, grant recipients can
3 begin to make payment requests for expenses already incurred (e.g.,
4 land, architectural and engineering fees, etc.).

5 Assembly Member Corbett inquired about the possibility of the
6 accrual of interest on the grant funds prior to their release to grant
7 recipients. Treasurer Angelides addressed her question and indicated
8 that there is no interest. When there is a request for funds from a grant
9 recipient, the Pooled Money Investment Account advances the funds
10 which are later replenished from the sale of bonds. Bonds are not sold
11 until projects are already underway.

12 Assembly Member Corbett expressed concern over a situation
13 where a grant recipient might lose local matching funds. Mr. Hall replied
14 that in such a case, grant recipients would notify the State Library, and it
15 could be possible for an applicant's governing body to vote to return the
16 grant funds to the State. This occurred during the previous Bond Act,
17 and the Board reconvened to award the funds to another applicant.

18 Assembly Member Corbett inquired about the possibility of awarding
19 less than the amount requested, which had been suggested by many
20 applicants. Dr. Starr referred the question to California State Library
21 General Counsel, Paul Smith, who replied that the statute requires that
22 the project be funded at 65 percent.

1 Assembly Member Corbett thanked those who spoke so
2 passionately about their projects and remarked on the difficult grant
3 award choices to be made. She proposed funding the applications with
4 an overall rating of "Outstanding," and awarding the remaining funds of
5 approximately \$18 million at a later date and not carry the funds over to
6 Cycle 3. She also suggested that staff review the remaining applications
7 in light of differing ratings for some applications between Cycles 1 and 2.

8 Dr. Starr indicated agreement concerning awarding grants to all of
9 the "Outstanding" applications. He indicated he did not concur with re-
10 evaluating the remaining applications, since all Cycle 2 applications
11 arrived at their respective ratings by the same evaluators, with the same
12 criteria, using the same process, which is a fair process.

13 Other Board members were asked to comment. Treasurer
14 Angelides began by thanking the audience for coming to the meeting, and
15 he concurred with Dr. Starr's earlier comment concerning the high quality
16 of the applications. He said it's very clear to him that there would be a
17 political movement to try to place another library bond on the ballot. He
18 said, that in his experience on capital outlay boards, he has not seen this
19 quality of projects with this dearth of funding and that his preference
20 would be for this kind of bond measure.

21 Mr. Angelides went on to mention some of the applications that had
22 overall ratings other than "Outstanding" that he feels are compelling:
23 Redding, Walnut Creek, Castroville, Lawndale, Pickleweed, and San

1 Marino. He suggested that each member could recommend the projects
2 they believe should receive a grant award to see where there were
3 commonalities. Alternatively, the "Outstanding" applications could be
4 funded. He could accept either approach. He suggested another
5 approach could be to vote on the question of awarding grants to all of the
6 "Outstanding" applications and have a special meeting after a short
7 break.

8 Dr. Starr asked Mr. Smith to speak to the issue of recessing the
9 meeting until a later date. Mr. Smith indicated that for Cycle 1 a second
10 meeting was scheduled approximately two weeks after the first meeting.

11 Mr. Angelides asked if there is a formal appeal process after the
12 ratings have been made. Mr. Hall indicated that there is not. Dr. Starr
13 reminded the Board that an appeal process should have to have been
14 part of the rules for the administration of the act and that he believes the
15 current process ensures staff objectivity. Allowing contact from
16 applicants to elicit rating changes would jeopardize the objectivity.

17 Senator Alpert suggested taking a vote on awarding grants to the
18 "Outstanding" applications. She said she would be open to awarding the
19 remainder at the current meeting or at a future meeting. One approach
20 to awarding the remaining funds would be to begin funding applications
21 with the smallest dollar amounts in order to fund as many applications as
22 possible. Another approach would be to fund Redding, because it's a

1 regional center, and a couple of applications with low grant requests. She
2 recommends the Castroville and Pickleweed projects.

3 Mr. Pachino indicated that his view was to pass the "Outstanding"
4 applications and move the remaining funds to Cycle 3, because he cannot
5 find a way to distinguish between the applications with an overall rating
6 of "Very Good." Rolling the remaining funds to Cycle 3 would give the
7 Cycle 2 "Very Good" applications an opportunity to improve their
8 applications for Cycle 3. He is opposed to funding a project based on its
9 low grant request amount because a number of "Very Good" projects
10 would be disadvantaged.

11 Ms. Mateo encouraged a vote on the "Outstanding" applications so
12 they can move forward, and indicated she was ready to vote on the
13 balance at the current meeting. Her recommendations were Shasta-
14 Redding, Castroville, and Pickleweed applications.

15 Dr. Starr asked Assembly Member Corbett the status of her earlier
16 motion. She amended the motion to relate only to the funding of the
17 "Outstanding" applications.

18 ***It was moved and seconded (Corbett/Mateo) that***
19 ***the Board award grants to all applications with an***
20 ***overall rating of "Outstanding." The motion carried***
21 ***unanimously.***
22

23 Ms. Corbett indicated she felt the next question was whether to
24 award the remaining funds or to carry them over to Cycle 3.

1 Mr. Angelides pointed out that Senator Alpert and Ms. Mateo
2 indicated they were ready to vote on additional grant awards.

3 Dr. Starr said he was also ready to vote to award the remaining
4 funds and indicated his choices to be the Shasta-Redding application,
5 because of its regional role, and the Castroville and Pickleweed library
6 applications.

7 ***It was moved (Mateo) that the Board award grants***
8 ***to the Shasta-Redding, Castroville, and Pickleweed***
9 ***applications. There was no second.***
10

11 When Dr. Starr asked if there was a desire to vote on the Redding
12 application alone, Mr. Angelides indicated his support of the project, as
13 well as the others mentioned by Senator Alpert [*Castroville and*
14 *Pickleweed*] and San Marino. The Board members continued their
15 discussion of the advantages of awarding the remaining funds at the
16 current meeting, convening a second meeting to award the funds, or
17 carrying-over the remaining funds to Cycle 3.

18 After clarifying with Mr. Smith that the chair can second a motion,
19 Dr. Starr seconded Ms. Mateo's motion and asked her to restate it.

20 Mr. Pachino made a substitute motion. In response to Dr. Starr's
21 query, Mr. Smith confirmed that the substitute motion should be voted on
22 first.

23 ***It was moved and seconded (Pachino/Corbett)***
24 ***that the Board move the balance of the funds in***
25 ***the second cycle to the third cycle, to be heard***
26 ***next year. Ayes: 2 - Motion failed***

1
2 Dr. Starr called the vote on the original motion, asking for a show
3 of hands.

4 ***It was moved and seconded (Mateo/Starr) that***
5 ***the Board award grants to the Shasta-Redding,***
6 ***Castroville, and Pickleweed applications. Ayes: 4***
7 ***– Motion carried.***
8

9 Dr. Starr called the vote on the original motion, asking for a show
10 of hands.

11 **ADJOURNMENT**

12 Dr. Starr adjourned the meeting at 6:36 p.m.

13

14 Respectfully submitted,

15 _____
16 Linda Springer, Deputy Library Bond Act Manager

17

18 Dated: November 10, 2004

19 Adopted: November 29, 2004